## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## DALE NORMAN HARMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-01585-WHO

ORDER GRANTING LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT AND VACATING MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

Re: Dkt. No. 15, 46

On August 9, 2016 plaintiff Dale Harms moved for leave to file a First Amended Complaint. Dkt. No 46. A court "should freely give leave when justice so requires." Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a). "Although the rule should be interpreted with 'extreme liberality,' leave to amend is not to be granted automatically." Jackson v. Bank of Hawaii, 902 F.2d 1385, 1387 (9th Cir. 1990). "Absent prejudice, or a strong showing of any of the remaining [ ] factors, there exists a presumption under Rule 15(a) in favor of granting leave to amend." Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003).

Defendants oppose the motion, arguing that leave to amend would be futile as Harms's proposed amended complaint does not include any viable claims. Dkt. No. 51. at 7. Defendants raise some strong critiques of Harms's proposed amended complaint, but given the liberal standard for granting leave, that Harms has not previously amended his complaint and that he is representing himself in this proceeding, I GRANT Harms's motion for leave to file a First Amended Complaint.

Harms will have 10 days to file his amended complaint. He may file the proposed amended complaint he submitted with his motion or he may revise it to further address the critiques defendants raise. I am not deciding whether I would have granted defendants' pending

## Case 4:16-cv-01585-CW Document 58 Filed 09/09/16 Page 2 of 2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Northern District of California United States District Court

IT IS SO ORDERED.
for September 14, 2016 on these motions is VACATED.
amend, defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings is DENIED as moot. The hearing set
attempt if the next amendment is not sufficient. Because I GRANT Harms's motion for leave to
defendants' argument that he cannot state a plausible claim; I may not allow him to make a third
motion on the merits, but I strongly advise Harms to be sure he alleges sufficient facts addressing

Dated: September 9, 2016

